NPS-53Ru75061 2

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California

RELATIONS AMONG THE MULTIPLIERS FOR PROBLEMS
WITH BOUNDED STATE CONSTRAINTS

I. Bert Russak

24 June 1975

Final Report for Period April 1975-June 1975

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Prepared for: Chief of Naval Research,
Arlington, Virginia 22217

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

Rear Admiral Isham Linder
Superintendent

Jack R. Borsting
Provost

The work reported herein was supported by the Foundation Research Program with funds provided by the Chief of Naval Research, Arlington, Virginia, during FY 1974 and 1975.

This report was prepared by:

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER	NPS-53Ru750612
2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	
3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	RELATIONS AMONG THE MULTIPLIERS FOR PROBLEMS WITH BOUNDED STATE CONSTRAINTS
5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	Final Report 4/74-6/75
6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s)	I. Bert Russak
8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940
10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	61152N;rr000-01-10;P0-4-30001
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	Chief of Naval Research Arlington, Virginia
12. REPORT DATE	23 June 1975
13. NUMBER OF PAGES	12
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	
15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	UNCLASSIFIED
15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	Approved for public release; distribution unlimited
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)	
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)	Optimization, Calculus of variations, State Constraints

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

In previous articles, the author established certain necessary conditions for control problems with constraints of the form $\psi^{\alpha}(t,x) \leq 0$ $\alpha=1,\ldots,m$. These conditions involve certain multiplier functions $\mu_{\alpha}(t)$ of the derivatives of the above constraints together with multiplier constants K^{α} used in the transversality relation. In this note, it is shown that these terms satisfy $\mu_{\alpha}(t^0) \leq K^{\alpha}$ with $\mu_{\alpha}(t^0) = K^{\alpha}$ if $\psi^{\alpha}(t^0) < 0$.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

1. Introduction

We consider the following problem. Let A be the class of arcs a :

$$a: \qquad x^i(t) \qquad u^k(t) \qquad b^\sigma \qquad t^0 \le t \le t^1$$
$$i=1,\dots,N \qquad k=1,\dots,K \qquad \sigma=1,\dots,r$$

which[1] have points $t,x(t),u(t)$ in a region R in t-x-u space, b in a region B in b space and $u(t)$ piecewise continuous, and which satisfy the conditions

(1-1) $\qquad \dot{x}^i(t) = f^i(t,x(t),u(t)) \qquad i=1,\dots,N$

(1-2) $\qquad \psi^\alpha(t,x(t)) \le 0 \qquad \alpha=1,\dots,m$

(1-3) $\qquad I_\gamma(a) \le 0 \quad 1 \le \gamma \le p' \qquad I_\gamma(a) = 0 \quad p' < \gamma < p$

(1-4) $\qquad x^i(t^s) = X^{is}(b) \qquad s=0,1 \qquad 1 \le i \le N$

where:

$$I_\gamma(a) = g_\gamma(b) + \int_{t^0}^{t^1} L_\gamma(t,x(t),u(t))dt \qquad \gamma=1,\dots,p \quad .$$

It is desired to minimize the functional

(1-5) $$I_0(a) = g_0(b) + \int_{t^0}^{t^1} L_0(t,x(t),u(t))dt$$

on the class A .

The functions ψ^α are assumed to be of class C^2 on R while the functions f^i , L_γ , g_γ , X^{is} are of class C^1 on R or B as the case may be.

Assume, next, that the arc

$$a_0: \qquad x_0(t) \qquad u_0(t) \qquad b_0 \qquad t^0 \le t \le t^1$$

---

[1] Unless otherwise specified, the symbols i,k,σ,α will have the respective ranges $1 \le i \le N$, $1 \le k \le K$, $1 \le \sigma \le r$, $1 \le \alpha \le m$.

is a solution to our problem and define the functions[2]

$$(2) \qquad \phi^{\alpha}(t,x,u) = \psi^{\alpha}_{t} + \psi^{\alpha}_{x^i} f^i \qquad \alpha=1,\ldots,m \; .$$

For arcs in the class A , these functions act as $d\psi^{\alpha}/dt$ along these arcs. We assume that the matrix

$$(3) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} \phi^{\alpha}_{u^k} & \delta_{\alpha\beta}\,\psi^{\beta} \end{bmatrix} \qquad \alpha,\beta=1,\ldots,m$$

(where $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Kronecker delta) has rank m on the set R_0 of points $(t,x_0(t),u)$ satisfying

$$\psi^{\alpha} \leq 0$$

$$(4) \qquad \phi^{\alpha} \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \text{ with } \psi^{\alpha} = 0 \text{ or } \phi^{\alpha} \leq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \text{ with } \psi^{\alpha} = 0$$

$$1 \leq \alpha \leq m \; .$$

Referring to Theorem 3.1 of [1] and to the quantities $\mu_{\alpha}(t)$, K^{α} of that theorem, we prove[3] the following result:

Lemma: For each α we have

$$(5) \qquad \mu_{\alpha}(t^0) \leq K^{\alpha} \text{ with } \mu_{\alpha}(t^0) = K^{\alpha} \text{ if } \psi^{\alpha}(t^0) < 0 \; .$$

2. Proof of the Lemma

It is convenient to prove this result by first transforming the problem. In section 4 of [1] the problem stated above is shown to be equivalent to a

---

[2]For a function $M(t,x,u,b)$, the symbols M_t , M_{x^i} , M_{u^k} , M_{b^σ} will denote first partial derivatives with respect to the indicated variable. Also, unless otherwise noted, repeated indices are summed. Finally for a function $K(t,x,u)$ evaluated on the arc a_0 as $K(t,x_0(t),u_0(t))$, we shall write $K(t)$.

[3]In Theorem 3.2 of [1], the multipliers $\mu_{\alpha}(t)$ are modified (by the addition of additive constants) from those of Theorem 3.1 of [1] . The results of this note then imply associated results to the multipliers of that theorem. Similar remarks hold in the Theorems of [2] .

reformulated problem (with superscript bars used on quantities in the reformulated problem to distinguish them from the original problem so that for example, $\bar{\psi}^\alpha$ replaces ψ^α)[4] with functions $\bar{\psi}^\alpha$, $\bar{\phi}^\alpha$ formed from the functions ψ^α, ϕ^α and with the major distinction from the above problem being that the assumption involving (3) is replaced by the statement that the matrix

$$\left[\bar{\phi}^\alpha_{u^k} \right] \tag{6}$$

has rank m at points in $\bar{D}$. Here $\bar{D}$ is the set of points $(t, \bar{x}_0(t), u)$ in $\bar{R}_0$ with $u = \bar{u}_0(t)$ or for arbitrary u with t interior to an interval of continuity of $\bar{u}_0(t)$. Now $\bar{\phi}^\alpha = \frac{d\bar{\psi}^\alpha}{dt}$ and so (6) implies in particular that

$$\left[\bar{\psi}^\alpha_{x^i}(t^0) \right] \quad \text{has rank } m . \tag{7}$$

The theorem for this latter problem is Theorem 6.1 of [1] and as shown in section 7 of [1], the terms $\mu_\alpha(t)$, K^α of that theorem and of Theorem 3.1 of [1] for the original problems are the same. In addition, $\bar{\psi}^\alpha(t^0) = 0$ iff $\psi^\alpha(t^0) = 0$ $\alpha=1,\ldots,m$, as shown in (36) of [1]. This proving our lemma for the reformulated problem will prove it also for the original problem.

We concentrate on the reformulated problem of section 4 of [1].

In order now to prove the first inequality of (5), assume that η is an index such that

$$\bar{\psi}^\eta(t^0) < 0 \tag{8}$$

and let h be any N dimensional vector such that $\bar{\psi}^\eta_{x^i}(t^0)h^i \neq 0$. Now,

---

[4] Also the dimensions of the variables x,u,b, change in the reformulated problem, however we shall not go into that here.

according to (7), we can select a vector d such that

$$(9)\qquad \begin{aligned} \bar{\psi}^{\eta}_{x^i}(t^0)d^i &= \bar{\psi}^{\eta}_{x^i}(t^0)h^i \\ \bar{\psi}^{\alpha}_{x^i}(t^0)d^i &= 0 \qquad \alpha \neq \eta \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Next, select a constant $\delta > 0$ so small that

$$(10)\qquad \bar{\psi}^{\eta}(t) < 0 \qquad t^0 \leq t \leq t^0 + \delta$$

and define the K dimensional arc w such that

$$(11\text{-}1)\qquad \begin{aligned} w^{\alpha}(t^0) &= \bar{\psi}^{\alpha}_{x^i}(t^0)d^i \\ \dot{w}^{\alpha}(t) &= \begin{cases} (-\bar{\psi}^{\alpha}_{x^i}(t^0)d^i)\,\frac{2}{\delta} & t^0 \leq t \leq t^0 + \frac{\delta}{2} \\ 0 & t^0 + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq t \leq t^1 \end{cases} \qquad \alpha=1,\ldots,m \end{aligned}$$

$$(11\text{-}2)\qquad w^{\Gamma}(t) \equiv 0 \qquad \Gamma = m+1,\ldots,K \qquad t^0 \leq t \leq t^1 \quad .$$

Then ω is in the class W of section 13 of [1] and by Lemma 13.1 of [1], we can find an admissible variation[5]

$$(12)\qquad \delta a : \qquad \delta x(t) \qquad \delta u(t), \qquad \delta b \qquad t^0 \leq t \leq t^1$$

satisfying

$$(13\text{-}1)\qquad \delta x^{j_s}(t^0) = d^{j_s} \qquad j_s \neq i_\rho \qquad s=1,\ldots,N-m \; .$$

$$(13\text{-}2)\qquad \delta b = 0$$

---

[5]See Section 11 of [1].

where i_ρ are the indices of (108) of [1] and also satisfying

$$(14)\qquad \begin{aligned} &\bar{\psi}^\alpha_{x^i}(t)\delta x^i(t) = \delta\bar{\psi}^\alpha(t) = w^\alpha(t) && \alpha=1,\ldots,m \\ &\delta\bar{\phi}^\Gamma(t) = w^\Gamma(t) \qquad \Gamma=m+1,\ldots,K && t^0 \le t \le t^1 \end{aligned}$$

where: $\delta\bar{\psi}^\alpha(t)$, $\delta\bar{\phi}^\Gamma(t)$ indicate[6] the variations in these quantities due to the variation δa and where $\bar{\phi}^\Gamma$ are the functions of section 8 of [1]. According to the above and by the admissibility of δa , we have that

$$(15)\qquad \delta\bar{\phi}^\alpha(t) = \frac{d}{dt}\,\delta\bar{\psi}^\alpha(t) = \dot{w}^\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} \left(-\bar{\psi}^\alpha_{x^i}(t^0)d^i\right)\frac{2}{\delta} & [t^0 , t^0 + \frac{\delta}{2}] \\ 0 & [t^0 + \frac{\delta}{2} , t^1] \end{cases}$$

and by (14) and (11-2) also

$$(16)\qquad \delta\bar{\phi}^\Gamma(t) \equiv 0 \qquad \Gamma = m + 1,\ldots,K \qquad t^0 \le t \le t^1 \quad .$$

In addition, by (11-1), (13-1), and (14) evaluated at $t = t^0$, we have

$$(17)\qquad \bar{\psi}^\alpha_{x^{i_\rho}}(t^0)[d^{i_\rho} - \delta x^{i_\rho}(t^0)] = 0 \qquad \rho,\alpha = 1,\ldots,m$$

where i_ρ are the indices of (108) of [1]. Then by the nonsingularity of the matrix $\left[\bar{\psi}^\alpha_{x^{i_\rho}}(t^0)\right]$ (see (108) of [1]), we see that $\delta x^{i_\rho}(t^0) = d^{i_\rho}$ $\rho=1,\ldots,m$, so that together with (13-1) we obtain

$$(18)\qquad \delta x^j(t^0) = d^j \qquad j=1,\ldots,N \quad .$$

---

[6] See section 11 of [1] .

Next, by (155-2) and Lemmas 11.1 and 15.1 all of [1], together with (15), (16) and (18), we get by computing the variation of the functionals introduced in (69) and (70) of [1] that

$$(19)\quad \tilde{\lambda}_\rho \int_{t^0}^{t^0+\delta/2} F_{\rho u^k}\, \zeta_\alpha^k (-\bar{\psi}^\alpha_{x^i}(t^0)d^i)\, \frac{2}{\delta}\, dt - \tilde{\lambda}_{p+N+i} d^i \geq 0 \qquad \rho=0,1,\ldots,p+N$$

where F_ρ, ζ_α^k, $\tilde{\lambda}_{p+N+i}$ are quantities introduced in section 8 of [1].

Using the relations (76-1) of [1] (between $\tilde{\lambda}_{p+N+i}$ and K^α) and (9), we see that (19) becomes

$$(20)\quad \tilde{\lambda}_\rho \int_{t^0}^{t^0+\delta/2} F_{\rho u^k}\, \zeta_\eta^k (-\bar{\psi}^\eta_{x^i}(t^0)h^i)\, \frac{2}{\delta}\, dt - K^\eta \bar{\psi}^\eta_{x^i}(t^0)h^i \geq 0 \quad (\eta \text{ not summed})$$

where K^η is that term referred to in our present lemma which is associated with $\bar{\psi}^\eta$. Furthermore, by the definition of $\mu_\alpha(t)$ in (74) and (76) of [1] then (20) is:

$$(21)\quad \left(\bar{\psi}^\eta_{x^i}(t^0)h^i\right)\left[\frac{2}{\delta}\int_{t^0}^{t^0+\delta/2} \mu_\eta(t)\,dt - K^\eta\right] \geq 0 \qquad (\eta \text{ not summed}).$$

According to the properties of the multipliers $\mu_\alpha(t)$, we can by reducing δ if necessary, guarantee that $\mu_\eta(t)$ is continuous on $[t^0, t^0+\delta/2]$. Then by taking the limit of the expression in (21), we get that

$$(22\text{-}1)\qquad \bar{\psi}^\eta_{x^i}(t^0)h^i[\mu_\eta(t^0) - K^\eta] \geq 0 \qquad (\eta \text{ not summed}).$$

Now we can repeat this same construction with $-h$ replacing h and so get

$$(22\text{-}2)\qquad \bar{\psi}^\eta_{x^i}(t^0)(-h^i)[\mu_\eta(t^0) - K^\eta] \geq 0 \qquad (\eta \text{ not summed}).$$

Thus, (22) implies that for any vector h with $\bar{\psi}^{\eta}_{x^i}(t^0)h^i \neq 0$, then

(23) $$\bar{\psi}^{\eta}_{x^i}(t^0)h^i[\mu_{\eta}(t^0) - K^{\eta}] = 0 \qquad (\eta \text{ not summed})$$

which implies that

(24) $$\mu_{\eta}(t^0) = K^{\eta} \quad .$$

Since $\bar{\psi}^{\eta}$ was an arbitrary constraint such that $\bar{\psi}^{\eta}(t^0) < 0$, then the second statement of our lemma is proven.

In order to prove the first statement of our lemma, let η be an index such that

(25) $$\bar{\psi}^{\eta}(t^0) = 0$$

and let h be a vector such that

(26) $$\bar{\psi}^{\eta}_{x^i}(t^0)h^i \leq 0 \quad .$$

Then as above, pick a vector d such that (9) is true and define the arc w as in (11) where δ is selected so that the multiplier $\mu_{\eta}(t)$ is continuous on $[t^0, t + \delta/2]$. The construction follows identical steps to the above to yield (22-1) while together with (26) and the arbitrariness of η , proves the first statement of our lemma and hence also the lemma.

REFERENCES

[1] I. B. Russak, On Problems With Bounded State Variables, J. Opt. Th. & Appl. 5-2(1970) pp. 114-157.

[2] I. B. Russak, On General Problems With Bounded State Variables, J. Opt. Th. & Appl. 6-6(1970) pp. 424-452.

[3] I. B. Russak, Second Order Necessary Conditions for Problems With State Inequality Constraints, S.I.A.M. J. Ctrl., 13-2(1975), pp. 372-388 .

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Defense Documentation Center (DDC) Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
Library Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	2
Department of Mathematics Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	1
Dean of Research Code 023 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	2
Associate Professor Bert Russak (53Ru) Department of Mathematics Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	20
Professor Frank Faulkner (53Fa) Department of Mathematics Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	1
Professor Craig Comstock (53Zk) Department of Mathematics Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	1
Professor Ladis D. Kovach (53Kv) Chairman, Department of Mathematics Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	1
Dean W. M. Woods (024) Dean of Educational Dev Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93941	1

QA402.5
.R878 Russak
Relations among the
multipliers for pro-
blems with bounded
state constraints.